



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

cn

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,278	12/29/2000	William R. Matz	00882	8926

7590 02/01/2002  
Thomas J. Edgington  
Kirkpatrick & Lockhart LLP  
535 Smithfield Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

EXAMINER

TRINH, MINH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3729

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/751,278

Applicant(s)

MATZ ET AL.

Examiner

Minh Trinh

Art Unit

3729

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-18 and 24-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant's election of Group IA (claims 1-3 and 23-23) in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-3 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrases; "removably attaching" (claim 1, line 2); "removably attaching" (claim 3, lines 1 and 2); "removably attaching" (claim 19, line 3), etc., unclear and confusing in that it is not known whether applicants are referring as to "removably" or "attaching".

The independent claims 1 and 19 called for a method for alignment an antenna with a satellite but however in the claims there is no step associated with the method for aligning. It is also not clear whether the azimuth reading is base on the orientation aligning position of the satellite and the antenna, i.e., in the instant case, there is no

Art Unit: 3729

step involving in the aligning of the antenna and the satellite. Therefore, it is unclear what method invention applicants are intending to encompass.

The limitation "detaching" (claim 2, line 1) is not known of how the cited "detaching" step is operatively associated with the claimed method for aligning. It appears to be that the detaching step would not affect the claimed method for aligning. Further, applicants should carefully revise the claims toward the method for aligning as set forth in the preamble of claims 1 and 19.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-2 and 19-23 as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 5,977,922 to Hemmingsen II.

Hemmingsen II discloses the method for alignment an antenna with a satellite of the present invention including: removable attaching a compass 42 to a rear portion of the antenna 10 (see Figure 4), moving the antenna to a position wherein the compass displays a reading that corresponds to a predetermined azimuth reading (figures 6-8, col. 1, lines 54-63, col. 3, lines 1-60), and retaining the antenna 10 in said position (col. 3, lines 62-67).

Regarding claim 2, Hemmingsen II discloses the detachable step (as shown in figures 3-4).

Limitations of claims 19-23 are also defined as set forth above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 3 as best understood is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hemmingsen II.

Regarding claim 3, Hemmingsen II discloses the claimed invention except for the step of attaching of a digital compass to the rear of the antenna. Regarding to the use of the different kind of compass, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to choose any desired compass since applicant has not disclosed that the use of a digital compass solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the conventional compass as taught by the Hemmingsen II, (see Figure 6, item 42). Noted that applicant should be aware that to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In this case, i.e. digital compass which have very little or no effect to the claimed method.

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Trinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-2887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday 8:00 am to 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on (703) 308-1789. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7307 for regular communications and (703) 305-3579 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

mt  
January 29, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'PETER VO', with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

**PETER VO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**